DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 456 CS 209 284

AUTHOR Mallonee, Barbara
TITLE Charting Institutional Change.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (36th, Minneapolis, MN, March 21-23, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Content Area Writing; Critical Thinking; *Educational Improvement; Higher Education; *Program Content; Program Development; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role; *Writing Improvement; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Research

ABSTRACT

One strategy used to improve teaching at Loyola College in Baltimore, Maryland, is a six-year writing across the curriculum project funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Faculty from 14 departments spend a year teaming with a member of the writing department; following that year of paired teaching, the content faculty become departmental writing coordinators. The final project will be a handbook on writing at Loyola. In evaluating the writing across the curriculum program, two codirectors, with professional assistance, developed a survey instrument, and the faculty will be surveyed three times in five years, producing a longitudinal survey. The first half of the survey assesses faculty attitudes, while the second half takes note of faculty practices in core courses and upper-division courses. The survey, administered in May 1984, revealed that the overall tilt in attitude was toward helping rather than harassing students. Unfortunately, the practices did not accord with those generous attitudes. The biggest goal of the program is to have all departments discover the types of writing professionals do and then examine what cognitive skills are necessary across the four-year undergraduate curriculum if students are to be socialized into the discipline. (A copy of the first survey instrument and a statement of goals for the program are appended). (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Barbara C. Mallonee
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Barbara Mallonee
Loyola College
4501 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, Md. 21210
(301)323-1010 X2807

ED260456

CHARTING INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

In November, William J. Bennett asked that we in the humanities "reclaim a legacy" by revamping trivial curricula and reinvigorating what his commission called lifeless, tendentious, mechanical, boring teaching. Bennett's report promises as one outcome of improved teaching that students will be able to "write lucidly or reason clearly and rigorously." It doesn't recognize what those of us involved in writing know: good teaching in any discipline uses writing as its chief pedagogical tool.

On our campus, a deep commitment to the humanities and a glance at some ominous demographics prompted a new "search for excellence," fortunately with a seventeen-course core curriculum already in place. One key strategy for improving teaching is a six year writing across the curriculum project funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities that I co-direct with Jack Breihan, Chair of the History Department. Faculty from fourteen of our seventeen content departments spend a year teaming with a member of the Writing Department; following that year of paired teaching, the content faculty become departmental writing coordinators. Our final project will be a handbook on writing at Loyola.

In building our writing across the curriculum program, we are as obsessed with the word search as with excellence. Locating the wonders that do and don't exist on a campus is an elusive business. Methodology for evaluation is like a kaleidoscope--twist the means of measurement and reality tumbles into new shapes.

Serving on the College's Budget and Planning Priorities Committee,

CS 209 284

I was amused to see that if one looks at such budgetary items as the cost of paper for printers, wordprocessing time on the Vax, the budget for faculty research, the number of file cabinets, mailboxes, waste-baskets, clearly we are an institution that writes.

For the Endowment, of course, we need to twist the kaleidoscope. NEH wants more traditional signs of change in the students who write and the faculty who teach them. One could measure with interviews and case studies; protocols: ethnographic observation. A program can be assessed through the artifacts faculty create--syllabi, check-lists, grade books, handbooks--and the products students produce. We've tried all of the above.

But the evaluative tool of choice in most WAC programs is the survey. So Jack and I wrote one, with professional assistance. And now we see-saw between what Egon C. Guba, in a UCLA monograph series on evaluation, describes as the flexibility of naturalistic inquiry and the security of its scientific counterpart.

We have imposed on our program a form of measurement appropriate for scientific research, a search that is recursive, that admits reexamination and replication. I have included a copy of our first survey instrument, administered in May 1983: the first section assays faculty attitudes; the second half faculty practices in both core courses and upper-division courses. We will survey our faculty three times in five years, producing a longitudinal or panel survey. The second survey takes place in May.

But now that the results of the first survey are in, with a response rate of 80%, we see quite clearly that the instrument will

reliably tell us a great deal about the quantity and scope of writing at Loyola--despite its tiny print, it's a big survey, and a good survey as surveys go. We see, however, that it will tell us far less about long-range improvement in the quality of teaching writing.

Before I lament what we haven't learned, let me sketch in for you what we have learned. We have masses of data in four categories we thought a good way to examine our program.

The first nine questions were to tell us the CURRENT STATUS OF WRITING INSTRUCTION. Actually, depending on who is looking through the kaleidoscope, the data, which you have as page 1 in your handout, can be interpreted in two ways: the malcontents might say, "Although students feel writing is appropriate and close to three-quarters of the faculty see improvement, students don't expect to improve in their courses, they do not do enough writing, and the freshman course doesn't serve them well at all"; when Pollyannas like me see such data, we might read differently: "Students do not do enough good writing," we might concede, "nor has the freshman course served them well; nonetheless, they feel that writing is appropriate and although they don't seem to expect to improve their skills in their courses, close to three-quarters of the faculty do see improvement."

Whether one bares or gilds the lily, however, it is clear from this section of the survey that there are changes to be made. When full-time faculty are separated from parttime, the negative responses are more vehement. In this section and throughout the survey, there is too large a number of no opinion responses. Ambivalence may be friendlier than disagreement, but, whether they stem from ignorance

or indifference, we would like to see fewer "no opinion's" in May.

The second section, RESPONSIBILITY FOR WRITING, which begins with Q10, is good news and bad news. Although 63% of the faculty disagree in Q10 that "student writing is primarily the responsibility of the Writing Department" and although 81% in Q14 feel that "each department should train its majors to do writing appropriate to their fields" and 74% in Q16 think this can be done, still only 30% report at the bottom of page 5 that their departments talk about writing--and a solid 77% of the full-time tenured faculty report emphatically that they do not. We thought it terrific that 70% of our faculty agreed in Q17 that "some kind of substantive written work should be assigned to students," until we looked at the practices section. There is far less written work than there should be--that makes the fact only 11% find they spend too little outside time on writing rather worrisome!

The fourth section, however, on page 9, tells us that our faculty <u>is</u> gratifyingly open to being "developed." While 38% in Q49 think it "too time-consuming for several instructors to work together on the teaching of writing," still 54% faculty said in May 1983 that they would consider participating in a forum for discussing student writing, including more than half of the parttime faculty--<u>and</u> more than half our faculty has been involved in our Empirical Rhetoric program or the two Faculty Workshops on Writing sponsored by our Writing Council. In fact, the 80% response to our survey is a further tribute to our faculty--especially since we had 89% response from the humanities, more than 80% from social and physical sciences, and the 53% response came in business and management where there is heavy adjunct teaching.

The meatiest section is the third, APPROACHES TO WRITING, designed

to see how ripe our faculty was for traditional writing across the curriculum doctrine. The preoccupation with mechanics was predictably alarming: 60% think faculty should "identify all mistakes on a student's paper" and 93.2% think "any faculty member who requires writing in a course should be knowledgeable about the rules and terminology of English grammar and punctuation." We hope in our May survey to see that the burden of editing has been shifted to students.

The overall tilt in attitude, however, is toward helping rather than harassing students. 58% endorse a variety in writing assignments, 57% written assignment sheets, 91.4% drafting, 50% peer groups. 56.4% approve conferences in the abstract even if 56.8% don't have time to hold them.

Unfortunately, the practices don't accord with those generous attitudes. Half the faculty may endorse written assignment sheets, but only 26% provide them. 91.4% may approve drafting, but only 8% require drafts in the core classes and only 12% in upper-division courses. Only a quarter of the faculty hold conferences--three-quarters of the full-time tenured argue that class sizes are simply too large.

Now, peering through the kaleidoscope at this pattern of blue and rosy responses, neither Jack Breihan nor I were surprised. The data validated the perceptions of writing at Loyola that led us to seek the grant in the first place. We would have been embarrassed to report to the Endowment that we had cried, "Wolf!" When we wrote this first survey, we thought ours would be an "excellent" program if we held fast to good behaviors and good will already in place and

instigated all the changes our questions implied were desirable.

But still another twist of the kaleidoscope suggests that a quality program in writing across the curriculum must do more than our survey will describe. Another configuration of our data shows that although our survey looks balanced and comprehensive and appropriate, in fact it is not.

Page 2 of our handout is a statement of the goals we set initially for the program and still intend to reach. When we tie each survey question to one of those fourteen goals, the questions sort out very unevenly, as the next 5 pages of the handout show. Most of the questions cluster (beginning on page 4) around faculty's ability to control the student's writing process and (on pages 5 and 6) the faculty's emotional health--whether they are positive and optimistic or defensive, lazy, lonely.

Secreted in these fourteen points is our <u>real</u> agenda--the final turn of the kaleidoscope that will produce the design we seek. Buried in that wordy fifth point (on page 2) and never addressed by a single survey question are the words "coherent writing skills across the curriculum." Those of us who have worked through year-long paired teaching in chemistry, philosophy, management, accounting, finance, political science, psychology, theology, sociology, and English, have come to see that to write in a discipline, students must be socialized into a field that has a governing mode of inquiry students must master. Elaine Maimon advanced the notion that students are apprentices to the Academy in a December 1979 article in <u>CCC</u> entitled "Talking to Strangers." Joe Williams spoke to the issue at the Delaware Valley PATHS conference at LaSalle University two weeks ago. By last summer

it was clear to Jack and me that our biggest goal is to have all departments discover the types of writing professionals do--but to then examine what cognitive skills translated into what sequential activities were necessary across the four-year undergraduate curriculum if the student were to be socialized into the discipline.

The goal of socialization pulls down the barriers separating terrified students from superior professors. It undoes a Gradgrind who would fill little vessels with Facts. It shifts humanities teaching from monologues delivered by demagogues to dialogue. It need not unseat the lecture format, but it mandates such activities as peer interaction, conferencing, drafting, editing; comments rather than stark letter grades; essay rather than multiple choice tests. OUr survey measures that increasing level of socialization.

But to realize inquiry as a goal, faculty must activate an enormous complex of cognitive tasks at different levels of difficulty, few of which we can even identify. In A New Case for the Liberal Arts: Assessing Institutional Goals and Student Development, David Winter and David McClelland take on the difficulty of evaluating liberal education. "Many liberal arts professors," they tell us, "view important outcomes of liberal education as ineffable and incapable of being broken down and assessed systematically." (14) I might interject that Peters and Waterman in In Search of Excellence point out that scientists too neither understand nor own up to their messy road to progress either. Winter and McClelland say further, "a concern for quick and easy measurement ofter has usurped a concern for the meaningful content of what is measured. It is not immediately clear how you can determine whether students think critically, but you can readily ask whether they applied

to graduate school or graduated with honors" (22)--or, in our case, whether or not they did a rough draft. Winter and McClelland provide a composite list of "presumed effects of liberal education" (included as page 8 of the handout) and insist that these are "processes for operating on and using information rather than mere knowledge of facts or information. As such, they should show up only when subject have to do something with data, and they should be most fully manifest in a record of what the subjects do."

In fact, that verb--do--has become the rallying point for our program. 82.6% of the full-time tenured faculty know, according to Q12, that difficulties in structure decrease as students clarify their thinking, but the practices section affirms that students' organization remains poor, hence, they do not know how to clarify their thinking. What does one do to clarify thinking??? Ouestion 38 shows that students divide into two camps--those who do and those who do not have a good production schedule for compositions. Q6 suggest that faculty assume students simply do not put a great deal of time into assignments--doing the wrong things. They don't know what to do between the time a paper is assigned and that grim hour when it is, in all its inadequacy, due.

The practices section affirms what a survey of university faculty's views and classroom practices, conducted by Charlene Eblen and reported in the December 1983 Research in Teaching English sets forth: that college faculty are far more interested in problems associated with communicative maturation than problems associated with standards of edited American English. Responses to items 19 and 20 in the practices section, included in your handout, show that Loyola students become

more analytic. But research by another colleague, Lucille McCarthy, who tracked several students from class to class, suggest that any improvements are fortuitous, not the result of good teaching designed to train students up to do what adult thinkers do. The sociologist with whom I am working this year signed up for ERIC because he was paralyzed when a student asked in desperation, "But what do I do to apply the symbolic interactionist perspective to the Dani of New Guinea?" Linda Flower recently had a group of Baltimore teachers struggle to break down into operant behaviors what they actually do when they analyze a poem or apply a theory. Jack Breihan has produced a history workbook of exercises that is a veritable roadmap of historian's thought processes. His department is now parceling out responsibility for developing through "doing" an enormous array of thinking skills.

It is no surprise that writing across the cirriculum at places like Alverno College or Beaver College has given way to critical thinking. Perhaps the most disturbing statistic in our survey was that 70% of our faculty think"students" difficulties in writing in my class result from the failure of their secondary schools to teach them to write." We think writing difficulties result from college faculty's failure to teach students to write. At Loyola, we want our faculty not only to like their students much more but to put forth a concerted and coherent effort to make their minds work--systematically, through writing. Articulating specific skills across the disciplines is a big agenda on a campus where 67% of the faculty have no idea what the freshman course does, and only 30% "sometimes" discuss writing with other faculty.

When we wade into uncharted waters, how do we measure the baseline and subsequent progress? Richard Larson, editor of CCC, has suggested portfolios of student work, a plan I think they are using at Iowa. Team-teaching yields rich data for ethnographic analysis. Writing our handbook will shape close scruitiny.

But we would like to try as well to improve our survey so that its items reflect our primary concern--whether faculty feel they directly influence their students' thinking skills. Possibly our most telling question in the survey is Q36 that asks whether all students should begin with a formal outline--that is a real watershed question. Finding such questions is difficult. I serve on the Board of Trustees of Friends School in Baltimore. Recently a researcher offered to test whether Quaker values were in place by having students circle lists of adjectives they thought applied to them and to their classmates. I find far more compelling the report of an AIMS evaluation team member who reported Quaker values were in place because as she wandered the hallways looking lost, no fewer than six children asked if they could help her find her way.

Marie Rosenwasser reported in a paper given at the Annual Conference of the Community College Humanities Association in San Francisco in 1983 that there is a strong correlation between faculty renewal and their success in improving students' basic skills. In teaching critical thinking through writing, we are working with behaviors so second-nature to us that we take them for granted--but students cannot categorize, summarize, instantiate, describe, provide transitions in order to create cumulative reasoning, balance thoughts on the fulcrum of the semi-colon.

Our ERII participants are renewed by the work they have done in making students do what they do. I would argue that if our May survey shows a drop in overall faculty enthusiasm and willingness, it will be because we have not addressed beyond our program for fourteen the real question central to Empirical Rhetoric II and to the renewal of humanities education--the teaching of the tools of inquiry.

THE SURVEY: VIEW ONE

CURRENT STATUS OF WRITING INSTRUCTION

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NO OPINION	DISAGREE	DISAGREE STRONGLY	NO RESPONSE
1. Loyola students do a sufficient amount of writing during their four years at the College.	4 / 1.7 (22.2%)	48 / 20.5	78 / 33.3	68 / 29.1 (44.8%)	29 / 12.4	7 / 3.0
2. The required freshman course, Effective Writing (CA113), trained my students to write effectively in my course sections.	3 / 1.3 (15.8%)	34 / 14.5	109 / 46.6	63 / 26.9 (84.2)	17 / 7.3	8 / 3.4
3. Students seem to feel writing assignments are inappropriate in my course sections.	10 / 4.3 (21.4%)	40 / 17.1	25 / 10.7	96 / 41.0 (65.8%)	58 / 24.8	5 / 2.2
4. Students expect to improve their writing skills in my course sections.	24 / 10.3 (28.7%)	43 / 18.4	54 / 23.1	66 / 28.2 (44.9)	39 / 16.7	8 / 3.4
5. I am satisfied with the quality of the writing done by my students.	7 / 3.0 (25.5%)	48 / 20.5	23 / 9.8	102 / 43.6 (69%)	30 / 81.4	4 / 1.8
6. I am satisfied with the amount of time my students spend outside of class preparing their written work.	6 / 2.6 (26.9%)	56 / 23.9	47 / 20.1	78 / 33.3 (50.4)	40 / 17.1	7 / 3.0
7. By the end of each semester, I usually see improvement in most of my students' writing.	24 / 10.3 (46.2%)	84 / 35.9	59 / 25.2	52 / 22.2 (26.5%)	18 / 4.3	3 / 2.2

8. In comparison with colleagues in my department,
(Check as many as apply)
(a) I assign 59 more 121 same amount of 27 less written work. 25.2% / 51.7% / 11.5% / 27/11.5%
(b) I assign 46 more 109 same amount of 31 less complex written work. 19.7% / 46.6% / 13.2% / 48/20.5
(c) I am 61 more 108 less 16 as rigorous in grading written work. 26.1% / 46.2% / 6.8% / 49/20.9

9. In comparison with colleagues in other departments at Loyola,
(Check as many as apply)
(a) I assign 58 more 49 same amount of 55 less written work. 24.8% / 20.9% / 23.5 / 72/30.8%
(b) I assign 49 more 51 same amount of 46 less complex written work. 20.9% / 21.8% / 19.7% / 88/37.6
(c) I am 56 more 66 less 22 as rigorous in grading written work. 23.9% / 28.2% 19.4% / 90/38.4

READING ONE: Although students feel writing is appropriate (Q3) and close to three-quarters of the faculty see improvement (Q7), students don't seem to expect to improve in their courses (Q4), they do not do enough writing (Q1,5,6), and the freshman course doesn't serve them well at all (Q2).

READING TWO: Students do not do enough good writing (Q1,5,6) nor has the freshman course served them well (Q2); nonetheless, they feel that writing is appropriate (Q3) and although they don't seem to expect to improve their skills in their courses (Q4), close to three-quarters of the faculty do see improvement.

EVALUATION: EMPIRICAL RHETORIC II

PURPOSE: To measure the effect of Empirical Rhetoric II on faculty attitude and practice at Loyola College.

SPECIFICALLY, whether faculty

1. see writing as an important skill distinguishing Loyola graduates;
2. see writing as inseparable from content;
3. understand the CA113: Effective Writing Curriculum;
4. endorse the CA113 curriculum;
5. seek to build students' sense that there are coherent and consistent writing skills and standards that apply across the curriculum;
6. choose to maximize amount and types of writing appropriate to their disciplines, recognizing writing is best taught in context;
7. see writing as a process in which they can and should intervene with
   - --written assignments, specifying audience, purpose, format, strategy
   - --models of good writing
   - --feedback on drafts or sequential writing
   - --response on the final draft that both defends a grade and teaches toward future writing;
8. see students should retain ownership of their writing tasks;
9. are positive about their ability to assign and respond to student writing;
10. are more optimistic that process and product will be good;
11. are less defensive about grading writing;
12. are agreed on a policy for handling mechanics;
13. feel less lonely as they work to improve writing;
14. feel the administration values their efforts toward improving writing.

EVALUATION: EMPIRICAL RHETORIC II

PURPOSE: To measure the effect of Empirical Rhetoric II on faculty attitude and practice at Loyola College.

SPECIFICALLY, whether faculty

	PERCENTAGES AGR	N/OP	DISAGR
1. see writing as an important skill distinguishing Loyola grads;			
Q1: Loyola students do a sufficient amount of writing during their four years at the College.	22.2	33.3	41.5
Q17: Some kind of substantive written work should be assigned to students in every class.	69.2	--	--
2. see writing as inseparable from content;			
Q33: Spending class time discussing writing decreases the amount of subject matter that can be taught in the course.	64.5	9.8	22.6
Q41: When assessing written work, faculty should grade "content" and "writing" separately.	38.0	13.2	45.3
3. understand what is taught in WR113, the freshman course;			
Q46: I have a clear idea what the required freshman course, WR113, covers.	22.2	9.0	66.6
4. endorse the WR113 curriculum;			
Q2: The required freshman course trained my students to write effectively in my course sections.	15.8	46.6	34.2
5. seek to build students' sense that there are coherent and consistent writing skills and standards that apply across the curriculum;			
Q4: Students expect to improve their writing skills in my course sections	28.7	23.1	44.9
6. choose to maximize amount and types of writing appropriate to their disciplines, recognizing writing is best taught in context;			
Q10: Student writing is primarily the responsibility of the Writing Department in the required freshman course.	26.9	9.0	62.4
Q14: Each department should train its majors to do writing appropriate to their field.	80.8	6.8	10.3
Q19: We discuss student writing during my department's meetings.	29	28.6	39.8

	AGR	N/OP	DISAGR
Q23: My department should encourage faculty to assign a variety of kinds of writing...	58.6	15.8	22.2

7. see writing as a process in which they can and should intervene with;

--written assignments, specifying audience, purpose, format, strategy

Q24: For substantial written work instructors should provide an assignment sheet specifying in writing what students are to do.	56.9	14.1	26.5
Q25: Assignments for substantial written work should specify number of pages audience purpose format grading criteria			
*PR5: In making assignments for written work, I...			

--models of good writing

PR5E

--feedback on drafts or sequential writing

Q27: Students should be encouraged to write and revise preliminary drafts of substantial written work.	91.4	4.7	1.7
Q28: If I offer students advice on drafts, I cannot accurately assess their ability to produce their own finished work.	18.3	14.1	64.1
Q35: For giving my students advice about writing individual conferences are less beneficial than written comments on their papers.	15.4	24.8	56.4
PR7: In trying to guide students through their writing, I ...			
PR9: I usually respond to student drafts of written work with...			
PR10: To help students as they revise drafts, I provide...			
PR15: When papers are returned...and when papers are revised,...			

--response on the final draft that both defends a grade and teaches toward future writing

PR11: I respond to final versions with...
PR12: When I return final drafts, I provide...
PR13: In this class, my purpose in writing comments...

*PR refers to Part II of the Survey, a record of classroom practices.

	AGR	N/OP	DISAG
8. see that students should retain ownership of their writing tasks;			
Q38: ___students in my class seem to plan a successful production schedule for substantial written work.			
Q39: A teacher should read every piece of writing that a student is assigned.	85.5	3.0	10.3
Q40: A teacher should grade every writing assignment that a student hands in.	68.4	6.0	24.3
Q45: A student should provide self-evaluation of substantial written work.	46.6	33.3	16.7
PR8: I (do or do not) read every piece of writing I assign.			
PR14: I (do or do not) return all written work to students.			
9. see the value of peer interaction;			
Q32: Students improve their writing when peer groups discuss preliminary drafts.	50.4	40.2	7.7
Q44: A student's substantial written work should be subject to peer evaluation as well as faculty evaluation.	19.2	26.1	52.6
PR7E: I provide time for (peer response)			
10. are positive about their ability to assign respond to student writing;			
Q48: I have some insecurities about my own writing.	36.3	5.6	50.8
Q54: Teaching in my discipline has given me insights about writing that would be useful to writing instructors.	43.6	35.0	20.1
PR6: In discussing writing in class,I...			
PR7: In trying to guide students through writing, I ...			
11. are more optimistic that process and product will be good;			
Q5: I am satisfied with the quality of the writing done by my students.	23.5	9.8	65
Q6: I am satisfied with the amount of time my students spend outside of class preparing their written work.	26.5	20.1	50.4
Q7: By the end of each semester, I usually see improvement in most of my students' writing.	46.2	25.2	26.5
Q12: Students' difficulties in structuring a piece of writing decrease as they clarify their thinking on the subject matter of a course.	68	15.0	15.4
PR17: I (do or do not) encourage my students to publish on campus			

	AGR	N/OP	DISAGR
PR18: I (do or do not) encourage my students to publish in professional publications.			
PR19: At this level, my students' work is strongest in...			
PR20: My students' writing is weakest in...			
PR21: Plagiarism (is or is not) a problem in my class.			
12. are less defensive about writing;			
Q18: I would characterize the amount of time I spend outside of class on student written work as (too little, just right, too much).			
Q28: If I offer students advice on drafts, I cannot accurately assess their ability to produce their own finished work.	18.3	14.1	64.1
Q29: If I offer students advice on drafts, I will not be objective when I grade the final paper.	10.7	12.0	74.8
Q31: It is a good idea for faculty to share their own writing with their students.	59.8	27.8	10.2
Q37: Holding individual conferences with students would alter the appropriate formality of the student-teacher relationship.	1.3	12.4	84.2
13. are agreed on a policy for handling mechanics;			
Q11: A Loyola upperclassman's errors in mechanics--grammer, style, punctuation--point to an inadequacy in the freshman course.	33.3	20.1	44.0
Q13: Students' errors in mechanics decrease as they understand better the material about which they are writing.	36.3	15.4	46.2
Q34: In-class drills on mechanics--grammar, style, punctuation--would improve my students' performance on written work.	49.1	24.4	23.5
Q42: In written work submitted to me, it is <u>not</u> appropriate for a student to...			
Q43: When a student's written work has basic errors in mechanics, faculty should...			
Q47: Any faculty member who requires writing in a course should be knowledgeable about the rules and terminology of English grammar and punctuation.	93.2	2.6	3.9
14. feel less lonely as they work to improve writing;			
Q3: Students seem to feel writing assignments are inappropriate in my course sections.	21.4	10.7	65.8
Q8: In comparison with colleagues in my department I assign (more,less,same)			

	AGR	N/OP	DISAG
Q9: In comparison with colleagues in other departments, I assign (more,less,same)			
Q15: Students' difficulties in writing in my class result from the failure of their secondary schools to teach them to write.	69.7	18.4	9.4
Q16: There is little that faculty members in my department can do to improve student writing.	17.1	7.3	73.5
Q20: My department has a uniform writing requirement for all courses.	15.4	20.9	60.3
PR16: I(never, sometimes, often) discuss student papers with other faculty.			

15. feel the administration values their efforts toward improving writing;

Q21: The Loyola College administration encourages teachers in all disciplines to include a substantial writing component in their courses.	40.6	34.6	23.5
Q22: Faculty who teach writing-oriented courses should be rewarded in a Merit Plan.	31.6	27.4	37.6
Q30: Whether or not I read and comment on preliminary drafts of student papers depends on class size.	53.8	15.4	27.4
Q36: I don't have time to hold individual conferences with an entire class, regardless of benefit.	56.8	12.4	29.1

16. are open to change and willing to put forth effort to make changes;

Q49: It is too time-consuming for several instructors from different departments to work together on the teaching of writing.	38	28.2	31.6
Q50: I would like to explore present or possible uses of writing in courses that I teach.	48.2	29.1	19.6
Q51: Faculty training for teaching writing should be offered within my department.	27.7	30.8	38.9
Q52: Training in teaching writing should be offered to faculty by the members of the Writing Department.	51.7	26.9	19.7
Q53: If a forum for discussing student writing were organized for faculty, I would consider participating.	53.9	23.5	20.1
Q55: I would like to learn more about the Empirical Rhetoric II (NEH) program.	51.7	30.8	15.8

GOALS AND PRESUMED EFFECTS OF LIBERAL EDUCATION

Taxonomy taken from A New Case for the Liberal Arts: Assessing Institutional Goals and Student Development

David G. Winter and David C. McClelland

All these statements of goals and presumed effects of liberal education overlap considerably, and so we have organized them into the following list. It is much briefer than the exhaustive taxonomies worked out by Bloom (1956) and Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964), but its categories are sufficient to show the main points of agreement and divergence among the writers we have quoted.

1. Thinking critically or possessing broad analytical skill: Hutchins, Harvard Committee, Dressel and Mayhew, and Barton.
   a. Differentiation and discrimination within a broad range of particular phenomena (especially within the history of Western culture): Plato, Harvard Committee, Dressel and Mayhew, Barton, and Bok.
   b. Formation of abstract concepts: Whitehead.
   c. Integration of abstract concepts with particular phenomena or concrete instances; making relevant judgments: Plato, Whitehead, Harvard Committee, and Dressel and Mayhew.
   d. Evaluation of evidence and revision of abstract concepts and hypotheses as appropriate: Dressel and Mayhew and Bok.
   e. Articulation and communication of abstract concepts: Harvard Committee, Dressel and Mayhew, and Bok.
   f. Differentiation and discrimination of abstractions, identification of abstract concepts: Plato, Harvard Committee, Faust, Dressel and Mayhew, and Bok.
   g. Comprehension of the logics governing the relationships among abstract concepts: Plato, Whitehead, and Bok.
2. Learning how to learn: Bok.
3. Thinking independently: Faust, Barton, and Becker.
4. Empathizing, recognizing one's own assumptions, and seeing all sides of an issue: Dressel and Mayhew, Barton, and Bok.
5. Exercising self-control for the sake of broader loyalties: Plato, Rhodes, Wilkinson, and Becker.
6. Showing self-assurance in leadership ability: Plato, Rhodes, Wilkinson, and Becker.
7. Demonstrating mature social and emotional judgment; personal integration: Plato, Harvard Committee, Dressel and Mayhew, Perry, and Bok.
8. Holding equalitarian, liberal, pro-science, and antiauthoritarian values and beliefs: Dressel and Mayhew and Barton.
9. Participating in and enjoying cultural experience: Dressel and Mayhew and Bok.